



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/692,907

10/23/2003

Ramin Rezaiifar

030135

8699

23696 7590 02/25/2011  
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED  
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER

SEFCHECK, GREGORY B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2477

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/25/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/692,907	REZAIIFAR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	GREGORY B. SEFCHECK	2477

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 2/17/2011 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☒ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

Applicant's Representative, Steve Raney, contacted the Examiner to discuss the present amendment, which corrects minor antecedent basis issues from a previous amendment, as well as making the claim language more consistent across the independent claims. It was agreed that such amendments would not affect the scope of the invention.

/Gregory B Sefcheck/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2477  
2-18-2011